



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210/3

Criminal Revision No.2692 of 2008 (O&M)
Date of decision: September 10th, 2025

Kashmir Singh
.....Petitioner
Versus

State of Punjab
....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Ms. Manveen Pheruman, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

Petitioner is challenging the judgment dated 18.11.2008 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran, whereby the appeal preferred by him against the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 08.10.2005 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Tarn Taran, in FIR No.84 dated 17.08.1993 under Sections 379, 411, 419, 420, 465, 466, 471 of the IPC registered at Police Station Sarhali, vide which the petitioner was convicted and sentenced as follows, was partly allowed to the extent of acquittal under Section 468 of the IPC while maintaining his conviction and sentence under Section 411 of the IPC:

Offence(s) under Section	Period of sentence	Fine imposed	Period of sentence in default of payment of fine
411 of the IPC	RI for 2 years	₹500/-	RI for 3 months
468 of the IPC	RI for 3 years	₹500/-	RI for 3 months

2. Both the sentences were ordered to be run concurrently.



CRR-2692-2008 (O&M)

-2-

3. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner has fairly conceded that, in light of the factual findings recorded by the learned trial Court, she will not press the instant petition on its merits. Instead, learned counsel seeks relief solely concerning the quantum of the sentence. Learned counsel argues that the FIR in question pertains to the year 1993, and the petitioner has endured the agony of a protracted trial for over 32 years. She further submits that the petitioner has led disciplined life since the crime in question and has not been involved in any other criminal case. Additionally, he has already served 2½ months of his substantive sentence of two years. Given these facts and circumstances, the learned counsel for the petitioner prays that a lenient view be taken and the quantum of sentence awarded by the learned trial Court be reduced to the period already undergone by the petitioner, as further imprisonment would serve no useful purpose.

4. Learned counsel for the State has, on instructions, not disputed that after the occurrence in question in the year 1993, the petitioner has maintained good conduct and has not been involved in any other untoward incident or criminal case.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

6. In view of the fact that the FIR in question pertains to the year 1993, and as has not been disputed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has been leading a disciplined life ever since then, this Court does not deem it appropriate to send the petitioner behind bars at this juncture.



CRR-2692-2008 (O&M)

-3-

7. The ends of justice would be, thus, met if while maintaining the conviction of the petitioner, his substantial sentence of two years is reduced to the period already undergone.

8. Ordered accordingly.

9. There shall be no modification with regard to fine.

10. The revision petition stands disposed of.

11. Pending application, if any, stands disposed of.

September 10th, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No